UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,010	09/18/2006	Susan D. Aster	21584P	6490
210 MERCK AND	7590 11/17/200 CO., INC	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 2000		ZAREK, PAUL E		
RAHWAY, NJ 07065-0907			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/593,010	ASTER ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Paul Zarek	1617		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period is Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from (6), cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 S This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3)☐ Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under B	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrays 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	cepted or b) objected to by the liderawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is objected.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

Application/Control Number: 10/593,010 Page 2

Art Unit: 1617

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

1. Claims 1-22 are currently pending.

Restrictions

2. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-13 and 15, drawn to drawn to a method of treating a condition responsive to inhibition of 11b-hydroxysteroid dehydrongenase-1 comprising administration of a compound of formula I wherein R³, R⁴, or R⁵ comprise cyclic group.

Group II, claim(s) 1-15, drawn to method of treating a condition responsive to inhibition of 11b-hydroxysteroid dehydrongenase-1 comprising administration of a compound of formula I wherein R³, R⁴, or R⁵ do not comprise cyclic group.

Group III, claim(s) 16-22, drawn to a compound of formula II wherein R³, R⁴, or R⁵ comprise cyclic group.

Group IV, claim(s) 16-22, drawn to a compound of formula II wherein R³, R⁴, or R⁵ do not comprise a cyclic group.

3. The inventions listed as Groups I-IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Umetsu and Sakakibara (JP 08012657, 1996, provided in IDS) teach compound of formula II wherein R⁸ is phenyl, substituted with (CH₂)nCO₂R⁷, where n is 0, and R⁷ is a C₁ alkyl, R² is methyl, R³ and R⁴ are halogen, and R⁵ is hydrogen (abstract). Although the instant Claim limits R⁸ to naphthyl or heteroaryl (not phenyl), phenyl and naphthyl groups are considered obvious variants of each other. Therefore, the invention as claimed lacks a special technical feature.

Application/Control Number: 10/593,010 Page 3

Art Unit: 1617

Election of Species

4. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic

invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as

to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

Groups I or II - formula I wherein the identity and location of R¹, R², R³, R⁴, R⁵,

R⁶, R⁷, n, and p are identified; and,

Groups III and IV - formula I wherein the identity and location of R², R³, R⁴, R⁵,

R⁶, R⁷, R⁸, n, and p are identified.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims

shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify

the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An

argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive

unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of

claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the

limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after

the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP

§ 809.02(a).

5. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Group I: Claims 3-13;

Group II: Claims 3-14;

Art Unit: 1617

Group III: Claims 17-20 and 22; and,

Group IV: Claims 17-20 and 22.

The following claim(s) are generic:

Group I: Claims 1, 2, and 15; Group II: Claims 1, 2, and 15

Group III: Claims 16 and 21; and,

Group IV: Claims 16 and 21.

- 6. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Umetsu and Sakakibara (JP 08012657, 1996, provided in IDS) teach compound of formula II wherein R⁸ is phenyl, substituted with (CH₂)nCO₂R⁷, where n is 0, and R⁷ is a C₁ alkyl, R² is methyl, R³ and R⁴ are halogen, and R⁵ is hydrogen (abstract). Although the instant Claim limits R⁸ to naphthyl or heteroaryl (not phenyl), phenyl and naphthyl groups are considered obvious variants of each other. Therefore, the invention as claimed lacks a special technical feature..
- 7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Application/Control Number: 10/593,010

Art Unit: 1617

9. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. <u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Page 5

- 10. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

 Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.
- 11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Zarek whose telephone number is (571) 270-5754. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30-5:00.

Application/Control Number: 10/593,010 Page 6

Art Unit: 1617

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PEZ

/Rita J. Desai/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625